



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/712,064	11/14/2000	David Dawson-Granados	MS1-824US	8943
22801	7590	08/08/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			PILLAI, NAMITHA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/712,064

Applicant(s)

DAWSON-GRANADOS ET AL.

Examiner

Namitha Pillai

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 31-45, 61-75 and 91-109 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 31-45, 61-75 and 91-109 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

RD

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Examiner acknowledges the submission on 4/6/05, wherein the arguments presented have been considered. The Examiner acknowledges that claims 107-109, wherein the contents of the claims were previously rejected but there was no reference to these distinct claims being rejected in the previous rejection. The rejection has been updated to reject all pending claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-15, 31-45, 61-75 and 91-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 2002/0052925 A1 (Kim et al.) and "HOW-TO Beat the ADS on FWP (Free Webpage Providers)?", herein referred to as the "HOW-TO" article.

Referring to claims 1, 31, 61 and 91, Kim discloses a graphical user interface with a display and a user interface selection device, which has the means for maintaining a single window interface through the web browser, as seen on the windows of Figure 2 (page 3, paragraph 45, lines 1-2 and paragraph 50, lines 1-6). Kim further discloses receiving a request to open a second browser window while a first browser window is displayed, and opening the second browser window if the request was initiated in response to a user action (page 6, paragraph 77, lines 7-9 and 16-19), wherein the user's request for another web page, through the clicking of a link is responded with the eventual display of the web page that the user had

Art Unit: 2173

requested. Kim does not disclose ignoring the request if the request was not initiated in response to user action. The "HOW-TO" article discloses ignoring the request if the request was not initiated in response to a user action, wherein these requests would be calls for pop-up advertisements, which are requested by users and as explained by the article, it provides a means for ignoring these pop-ups ads (page 1, lines 16 and 27). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention to learn from the "HOW-TO" article for implementing a means for ignoring the request for the display of advertisements, which are not initiated in response to a user action. Kim clearly discloses how pop-up advertisements are requested and displayed without any intervention from the user and the amount of annoyance this brings to users (page 1, paragraph 9). The "HOW-TO" article also discloses the annoyance that users experience and the inconvenience of these pop-up unrequested ads, and provides a solution for dealing with this problem. To relieve any inconvenience to the users, Kim would be motivated to follow the teachings of the "HOW-TO" article to implement means for ignoring the request that is not initiated by the users. Hence, one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention would have been motivated to learn from the article to implement means for ignoring the request that is not initiated by the users.

Referring to claims 2, 3, 32, 33, 62, 63, 92 and 93, Kim discloses opening the second browser window as a full-screen browser window if the request was initiated by a user action, this user action only possible after loading and before unloading of a page in the first browser window, in order for the user to view and click on this first browser window (page 6, paragraph 77, lines 7-9 and 16-19), and as seen in Figure 2, the reference number 204, is the second browser window shown in full-screen that is displayed in response to the user action, from the

Art Unit: 2173

first screen, reference number 200, wherein the first browser window would be superimposed or replaced with the second browser window as seen in reference number 204 of Figure 2.

Referring to claims 4, 34, 64 and 94, Kim discloses opening a second browser window between pages of the first and second browser windows, at which time a load finished event for the first browser window is finished but before receiving an unload event for the first browser window, thus discussing the events that occur “between pages” (page 1, paragraph 9, lines 1-4).

Referring to claims 5, 35, 65 and 95, Kim discloses that the opening of the second browser window based on the second web-page that the user is accessing, is distinct from the first browser window containing the first browser page, from where the user has clicked on a link (page 6, paragraph 77, lines 6-10 and 16-19), as also is seen in Figure 2, wherein the displayed of two different instances of the web browser is shown in relation to different time slots, thus showing two different instances.

Referring to claims 6 and 96, Kim discloses the unloading of one first browser instance, as disclosed in the “transition” from one page to another, to the loading of a second browser instance, wherein modifications of two both the browser window instances will occur as a result of these unloading and loading events (page 3, paragraph 44, lines 7-8).

Referring to claims 7, 37, 67 and 97, Kim discloses as seen in Figure 12, a first browser window containing a plurality of frames, represented as the “Ecatalog” and “Links” frames, wherein the request to open a second browser window, based on the user’s clicking of one of the links in these frames, represented as the “boxed” link, wherein the request is associated with one of the plurality of frames as seen, and wherein the method further comprises opening the second browser window after loading the frame associated with the request to open the second browser

Art Unit: 2173

window, as is seen in the transition of Figure 14 to Figure 15, wherein the second browser window displayed the “advertising at the speed of life” is associated with the “ADNETWARE” which is shown to be chosen by the user, and as seen in Figure 14, the frame has been loaded, allowing the user to choose their request which can then only be shown in the second browser window.

Referring to claims 8, 38, 68 and 98, as shown in the plurality of frames in Figure 14, the frames must be loaded then only displayed as seen in Figure 14, in order for a request to be made from these frames, and an associated second browser window to be displayed, associated with a request made from the frames, as seen in Figure 15.

Referring to claims 9, 39, 69 and 99, Kim discloses means wherein a dialog box represented as the click-on advertisement is stored locally and suppressed until a web page that is associated with the request to open the dialog box is displayed, wherein the advertisement is suppressed until a web page that is associated with the advertisement as been displayed, wherein then the dialog box is called on (page 6, paragraph 77, lines 8-14).

Referring to claims 10, 40, 70 and 100, Kim and the “HOW-TO” article discloses that amongst the information displayed with the browser window, includes multi-media data and new broadcasts, both of which include sounds (page 3, paragraph 44, lines 13-15), hence when these pop-up advertisements are ignored, as stated in previous claims, the sounds associated with these displays would also be ignored or suppressed. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention to suppress the generation of a sound associated with a browser window that is not displayed. Kim and the “HOW-TO” article established a system, wherein uninitiated requests by the user, such as pop-up advertisements would be ignored, wherein all

Art Unit: 2173

information associated with these ads/commercials would be ignored and hence, the sounds associated with these ads would be suppressed. Hence, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention to suppress the sounds associated with a browser window that is not displayed.

Referring to claims 11, 41, 71 and 101, Kim discloses receiving a request to close a browser window, closing the browser window if another browser window is open and ignoring the request if no other browser window is open (page 6, paragraph 77, line 16-19), wherein the AD window closes when the user requested window has been opened, but remains open when user initiated window has not yet been opened.

Referring to claims 12, 42, 72 and 102, Kim discloses maintaining a browser history, wherein a history of transitions between the first and second browser windows are maintained (page 3, paragraph 49, lines 8-11).

Referring to claims 13, 43, 73 and 103, Kim discloses means for maintaining a browser history through storing of the history of the displayed browser windows (page 3, lines paragraph 49, 9-11).

Referring to claims 14, 44, 74 and 104, Kim discloses means for building the browser history from all kinds of user and internet activities, thus including the history of a set of simultaneously open browser windows as seen Figures 12-16 (page 3, paragraph 49, lines 4-9).

Referring to claims 15, 45, 75 and 105, Kim discloses detecting through browser history a transition between two simultaneously open browser windows and in response to the detected transition, hiding one of the first and second browser windows and displaying a different one of the first and second browser windows (page 8, paragraphs 110-112).

Referring to claims 36 and 66, Kim discloses the communication of the two browser windows, wherein the first and second browser windows must communicate such that, once the user has clicked on a request on the first page to access a second page, communication has occurred between the pages, thereby forming a link in response to events occurring in the first browser window and second browser instances (page 6, paragraph 77, lines 8-10 and 17-20).

Referring to claims 106-109, Kim and the "HOW-TO" article discloses basing a determination that the request was not in responses to user action on information that the request was initiated during either loading or unloading of a page in the first browser window, wherein a determination is made for if pop-up ads are disclosed, wherein these pop-up ads are requested during loading and unloading of web pages ("HOW-TO", page 3, lines 9-18). Kim and the "HOW-TO" article also discloses basing a determination that the request was in response to user action on information that the request was initiated after loading and before unloading of a page in the first browser window, wherein the check for pop up ads, and the result of this check determine whether the request is a pop-up ad, which is a request that is not user initiated or a request initiated by a user which would not be a pop-up ad ("HOW-TO", page 3, lines 9-18).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 4/6/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to Applicant's arguments that Kim does not suggest a method for stopping pop-up ads. Kim discloses the displaying of full-browser windows, wherein a first browser window is replaced with a second browser window, wherein the second window would also be a full-browser window. Kim further teaches the role of advertisements and how advertisement

Art Unit: 2173

windows can fully replace a first browser window with it a full-browser window. The role of Kim primarily focuses on the use of full-browser window display style that is used in connection with displaying of online advertisements. The teachings concerning the ignoring of unrequested advertisements is done in the "HOW-To" article wherein a common teaching such as a means for avoiding unwanted pop-up ads has been disclosed.

With respect to Applicant's arguments that the "HOW-To" article discloses changing the code of the website and hence does not disclose browser technology which ignores instructions for opening up a second browser window. Regardless of the means through which the article teaches for how to ignore the second windows, the "HOW-To" article does serve the purpose of teaching that within browser windows, there are various solutions, which can be applied to ignore second windows that are not initiated by user's requests. The present claims simply state the feature of being able to ignore windows that are not requested by users and hence this teaching has been clearly disclosed in the "HOW-To" article through the many solutions, wherein these solutions can be applied to Kim's system. Applicant's arguments rely on further steps and processing, wherein the claims are broad in interpreting that a second window that is not initiated by a user is ignored, but does not state clearly the processing whether it be carried out by a browser or a user. Meanwhile, the arguments disclose details relying on details as to how the second windows are ignored, wherein the claims merely state that the windows are ignored but further does not teach a method for steps of how they are ignored.

With respect to Applicant's arguments that the combination of Kim and "HOW-To" does not teach the technology disclosed in the present claims. The present independent claims do not teach how the method for ignoring distinct windows are carried out. The claims merely teach,

that based on detection of user interaction, certain windows are ignored while others are displayed in a window. The arguments for combination rely on back end processing of both references that is not taught in the present claims. The arguments solely discuss processing steps of "HOW-To" carried out for ignoring certain windows, and discloses that the combination of the primary references is not valid based on these processing steps. The claims of the present invention, meanwhile does not disclose any processing steps of how certain windows are ignored based on user interaction, but only that certain windows are ignored while others are displayed. Therefore, one skilled in the art, could have been motivated to learn from Kim and the "HOW-To" references, the concepts of displaying windows in a window system and learning from "HOW-To" the general and well known concept of ignoring certain windows based on user interaction, wherein it has been clearly outline in the "HOW-To" article, that is teaching is useful in combination with browser technology for mean for ignoring certain windows.

With respect to Applicant's arguments that Kim and "HOW-To" do not disclose determining if the request was or was not initiated in response to a user action. The "HOW-To" article teaches means for determining when or if a pop-up ad has been detected, wherein the pop-ad would represent a window that has not been initiated as a result of user selection of that window. Wherein, there is a means especially based on the conditional statements provided in "HOW-To" that teaches if and when a pop-up ad has been detected.

Conclusion

4. Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and

Art Unit: 2173

Trademarks, Washington D.C. 20231. If applicant desires to fax a response, central FAX number (703) 872-9306 may be used. NOTE: A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for informal facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document. Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Namitha Pillai whose telephone number is (571) 272-4054. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571) 272-4048.

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Namitha Pillai
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2173
July 25, 2005



JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100